DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 288 CG 009 052

AUTHOR	Vandiver, Richard
TITLE	Premarital Sexual Permissiveness: Some Methodological and Substantive Issues.
SPONS AGENCY	Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale. Office of Research and Projects.
PUB DATE	Apr 74
NOTE	31p.; Presented at the Annual Meeting of The Midwest Sociological Society (Omaha, Nebraska, April 1974)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	College Students; *Data Analysis; *Permissive Environment; Research Projects; *Sexuality; Speeches; *Testing Problems; *Test Reliability
IDENTIFIERS	*Premarital Sexual Permissiveness Scale; Reiss (Ira)

ABSTRACT

The variable of permissiveness developed and measured by Ira Reiss in the form of a Guttman scale of premarital sexual permissiveness was subjected to critical analysis. Both conceptual analysis and testing of questions regarding methodology and interpretation of the scale were used. Several questions were raised about the Reiss scale including: (1) the setting for the administration of the scale; (2) the location of the premarital sexual permissiveness scale on a continuum of heterosexual permissiveness; (3) the removal of unnecessary and nondiscriminating items; and (4) Reiss' interpretation of the tolerance level of the community. A randomly selected sample of 300 students was given the questionnaire (1970-71). Data were analyzed using survey analysis procedures and comparison of Guttman scale results. Descriptive statistics are presented when appropriate, and crosstabulation results using chi-square and gamma are given. (Author/PC)

ED 094288

PREMARITAL SEXUAL PERMISSIVENESS: SOME METHODOLOGICAL AND SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES*

Richard Vandiver

University of Montana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Paper presented at Midwest Sociological Society Meetings
Session 54, Friday April 5, 1974, Omaha, Nebraska

*This article is based on research conducted by the author for a dissertation, R. Vandiver, "Sources and Interrelation of Premarital Sexual Standards and General Liberality-Conservatism," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1972. The author is grateful to Charles R. Snyder, Roland Hawkes, Ernest Alix, Robert Rossell, Elwin Zimmerman and Ray Rainbow for their comments and assistance. The research was assisted by a grant from the Office of Research and Projects in the Graduate School at Southern Illinois University.

I am indebted to William H. McBroom for helpful comments on this paper.

CG 009 052

INTRODUCTION

The concept implied by the adjective "sexual" used to describe behavior and relationships has very poorly marked boundaries. Like so many terms borrowed from everyday discourse by behavioral scientists, the term "sexual" applied to behavior, relationships or attitudes, is as obfuscating as it is descriptive. Rather than denoting "...the unique or distinctive qualities of that which is being defined," (Lastrucci 1963, p. 77), the designation of some behaviors as "sexual" merely provides some broad indications of how some persons come to perceive those behaviors. Which behaviors fit into the taxonomic category of "sexual" as opposed to the residual category of "non-sexual" is seldom clear. In short, as behavioral scientists, we may agree that some behaviors are "sexual" and other behaviors are "non-sexual," but the agreement does not imply that the categorization of behaviors in this way is based on scientific or even logical analyses.

The problem of definitions in science is a significant one which influences the way we conceptualize variables for measurement and observe those variables in human interaction. The study of "deviant" behavior, both in its broad theoretical approaches and in the specific areas, is currently undergoing reassessment of its definitions. The recognition that past research has been based on the use of political rather than scientific taxonomies for behavior, e.g., "criminal" vs. "non-criminal," "violence" vs. "nonviolence," etc., is producing a reconceptualization of much past research and theory. It seems to me that such a reconceptualization of the area of sexual behavior and attitudes is needed.

At present one of the most carefully tested and extensively used operationalizations of the sexual behavior variable is Ira Reiss's Premarital Sexual Permissiveness scale. Reiss's work (1963; 1964a; 1964b; 1965; 1967; 1971) is a notable attempt to standardize and systematize the accumulation of knowledge regarding human sexual attitudes. Based on his theoretical conceptualization of a typology of sexual standards (Reiss, 1960), Reiss developed a scale for measuring sexual attitudes. The scale is a highly reliable Guttman scale for measuring what Reiss calls "permissiveness" (Reiss, 1964b:189). Operationally, the term "permissiveness" refers to the acceptance of "full sexual relations" before marriage (Reiss, 1965:749). Reiss has used this scale, which he claims is the most highly tested of any scale in this area (Reiss, 1964b:198), in an empirical study using random samples of students and a national sample of adults (Reiss, 1967:12). This scale and Reiss's research have generated a great deal of debate and further study.[1]

Reiss's scale, called the Premarital Sexual Permissiveness (PSP) scale, includes twelve questions taking the form of "I believe that... [kissing, petting, full sexual relation]...is acceptable for the...[male, female]...before marriage...[when engaged, in love, with strong affection, no particular affection]. Kissing is undifferentiated; petting is defined as sexually stimulating behavior more intimate than kissing or simple hugging but not including full sexual relations; and full sexual relations is undefined. Engaged is undefined; love is defined as the

---

[1]For example, see (Harrison Bennett and Globetti, 1969; Heltsley and Broderick, 1969; Ruppel, 1969; 1970; Walsh and Susmilch, 1969; Cardwell, 1969; Kaats and Davis, 1970; Maranell, Dodder, and Mitchell, 1970; Middendorp, Brinkman, and Koomen, 1970; Walsh, 1970).

emotional state which is more intense than strong affection and which the respondent would define as love; strong affection is defined as affection which is stronger than physical attraction or average fondness or "liking" but less strong than the emotional state which the respondent would define as love; and no particular affection is undefined (Reiss, 1967:21-22). The scale is separated into identical parts applying to males and females. Respondents are asked to respond to both parts to determine their attitudes for their own sex as well as for the other sex.

Reiss presents extensive analysis of the scale's validity and reliability and instructions to others on how to use the scales (Reiss, 1967). This contributes significantly to the use and standardization of the scale and has resulted in the use of all or part of the scale by various authors (e.g., Davenport, 1966; Ruppel, 1969; Harrison, et al., 1970, Kaats and Davis, 1970; Maranell, et al., 1970; Walsh, 1970; Vandiver, 1972). Results reported in Reiss's and subsequent studies indicate highly uniform findings regarding coefficients of reliability and scalability of the PSP scale. Thus it would appear there is great potential for more systematic work in this area.

Underlying the PSP scale are at least four assumptions. 1. Permissiveness is implied to exist apart from sexual behavior. The scale measures sexual permissiveness as opposed to some other type of permissiveness. While it is not entirely clear from a scientific-logical perspective what all is involved in the variable of permissiveness as a general theoretical and empirical construct, the use of the PSP scale implies there is at least one other kind of permissiveness.

2. Permissiveness is implied to exist apart from social roles in the realm of courtship and marriage in American society. The PSP scale is a scale of premarital sexual permissiveness. Whether there are other scales of sexual permissiveness or whether premarital sexual permissiveness is a part of a larger variable of sexual permissiveness likewise is not entirely clear. It may be that the more general variable of sexual permissiveness contains several smaller scaleable parts. For example, marital sexual permissiveness, extramarital sexual permissiveness, or sexual permissiveness unrelated to courtship and marriage roles.

3. The concept permissiveness implies some inhibition. It is possible that in some behavioral categories the notion of permissiveness would not apply, for example, sexual glances. Only in those cases where there are some inhibitions governing the behaviors is the notion of permissiveness meaningful.

4. The PSP scale is clearly a scale of heterosexual sexual permissiveness since all items deal with a dyad relationship between a male and a female. There may be a concomitant scale of homosexual permissiveness which applies to dyad relationships between persons of the same sex. At the same time there may be sexual permissiveness scales that exist for heterosexual and homosexual groups of persons.

All of these assumptions raise a host of questions about the nature of the general variable. Users of the PSP scale have seemingly postulated that the variable of sexual permissiveness is that which the PSP scale measures. How this variable relates to other similar variables and actual behavior is the source of concern for both Reiss and others.

It should be pointed out that the PSP scale was developed and first used during the late 1950's and changes have occurred in sexual attitudes during the intervening period (Bell and Chaskes, 1970; Christensen and Gregg, 1970; Kaats and Davis, 1970). For refined measurement the PSP scale will need periodic updating to reflect these changes in attitudes. In addition, use of the PSP scale should provide conceptual sharpening and theoretical development which should be reflected in the updating of the scale.

The present paper proposes to deal with some of the issues surrounding the use of the PSP scale including its administration, its coverage of the dimension of permissiveness, and some interpretations of the scale that have appeared in the literature.

THE COMPARATIVE DATA

In a broader study aimed at developing a sociological theory of the acquisition of sexual standards alternative to Reiss's, the PSP scale was used as a dependent variable (Vandiver, 1972). Data were collected from a random sample of the total student population of a midwestern state university during the 1970-71 school year. A working sample of 300, representing 64 percent of the students contacted, was used for testing hypotheses consistent with the theoretical perspective developed.

The PSP scale was used both to provide data comparable to Reiss and because it has been thoroughly tested and extensively used. In the course of carrying out the present study, some questions arose concerning the administration of the scale and the conceptualization of the PSP variable. Clayton (1972) has also raised a number of potential problems with the

PSP scale and Reiss's use of it. While his criticisms deal primarily with the technical Guttman scaling aspects, he also raises other issues.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCALE

One of Clayton's criticisms concerned the administration of the questionnaire in Reiss's study. He says, "no actual control was exercised over the setting in which the questionnaires were completed" (Clayton, 1972:11). But is this really a problem? Kaats and Davis (1971), offer evidence that questionnaires which are voluntarily returned to the researcher do not differ significantly on a test of permissiveness from those answering in a classroom setting. Likewise in the present study a difference in setting for answering the questionnaire did not produce any differences in permissiveness.

Based on the experience of Ruppel (1969) it appeared that having students in the sample come to a convenient campus location to take the questionnaire would control the setting and get more accurate results. In addition, Ruppel obtained a high completion rate (83 percent) by using a combination of requesting students to come to a campus location and mailing the questionnaire to those who failed to respond. Thus the students in the selected sample for the present study were contacted by letter requesting that they come to several convenient campus locations at convenient times to take the questionnaire. An additional contact post card was sent to those who had not responded during the first week of data collection with an additional schedule of times and places in the convenient locations.[2]

---

[2]The locations included the researcher's campus office, the centrally located library, and rooms provided in or near all the major private and campus dormitory locations.

This approach produced a 27 percent response rate. Following this phase of the data collection the questionnaire was sent to all those who had not responded[3] including addressed, stamped return envelopes. This contact produced an additional 37 percent response for a total of 64 percent of the contacted sample.

To answer the question about what, if anything, was different about the two groups of responses other than the setting, tests were made comparing them on over 40 behavioral, attitudinal, and demographic variables. Only one of these variables (religious affiliation) produced a finding requiring rejection of the null hypothesis ($p < .05$) using a chi-square test. This was accepted as a chance finding since no other variables supported or tended to support the relationship. Thus the data in the present study do not support any contention that difference in controlled, classroom-type setting and residence or other setting chosen by the respondent, produces differences in responses to the PSP scale or on other variables. The existing data, therefore, do not provide any basis for Clayton's concern.

COVERAGE OF THE CONTINUUM

Another of Clayton's questions sums up several points about the PSP scale. "...Do the twelve items in the PSP scales adequately cover the

---

[3]While the questionnaire was anonymous, when students came to the controlled setting to take the questionnaire, they were asked to find and mark out their student identification number from a list of all the student identification numbers of students selected in the sample. This was explained as guaranteeing that they would not be contacted again about the study and was fairly obviously not an attempt to correlate identities with questionnaires.

PSP dimension or do they cover only a limited part of that 'uni' dimension?" (Clayton, 1972:18). My concern with the apparent overemphasis on the low-permissive end of the scale leads me to attempt to extend the "permissiveness" dimension. At the high permissive end of the PSP scale Reiss uses the undefined term "full sexual relations." He equates this term with coitus, and it seems reasonable that the term means at least that. While there are many variations of kissing and petting, as well as coitus, it seemed that the use of "coitus" or "sexual intercourse" would provide a conceptually clearer answer than "full sexual relations." It may be that some persons interpret "full sexual relations" to include other types of heterosexual behavior while others interpret it to mean only sexual intercourse.

In the present study the term "full sexual relations" was dropped and replaced by the term "sexual variations" under the four conditions of relationship-intensity was included. "Sexual variations" were defined in the instructions with the scale as "sexually stimulating behavior, heterosexually engaged in, involving oral-genital (mouth-genital) or genital-anal contacts." Since it is probable that some of the students would not accept sexual variations even following marriage, an additional question was asked to locate these respondents.

As noted earlier, evidence exists that changes in sexual standards have occurred since Reiss collected his data. Clearly the direction of this change is toward the highly permissive end of the PSP scale. Thus refinement and updating of the scale would require greater discriminating ability at the highly permissive end. Table one indicates the results

of the responses to the basic twelve items in the PSP scale in the present study as compared to Reiss's results.

Table 1 about here

While the overall results are comparable in terms of ranking of items and Guttman scaling, the sample for the present study was clearly higher on permissiveness than Reiss's student samples. Even Reiss's liberal college sample (1967:33) was lower on permissiveness than the present sample. This appears to be further evidence that a shift in attitudes has occurred.

In the present study as in Reiss's study, the questions on kissing provided little discrimination between students. As is evident from Table 1 there is near unanimous agreement with the first three kissing items. As Reiss (1967:36) notes, future use of the PSP scale for measuring high and low permissiveness, particularly on college populations, could omit the first three kissing items with no loss of data. In addition it became evident in the administration of the questionnaire that the kissing questions were felt to be a waste of time. The most frequent complaint of the student respondents to the questionnaire was impatience with the "trite" questions on kissing and petting. Elimination of these kissing questions would not have eliminated any discriminating power and would have improved rapport.

The overall results in Table 1 were consistent with the results obtained from scaling the items in the universal scale.[4] Tables 2 and 3 in-

[4]Reiss (1967:35-36) discusses the use of the 5-item universal scale. The scale types and items in the universal scale are: scale type 0--acceptance of 1, 2, or 3 only; Scale type 1--acceptance of items 5 or 6; Scale type 2--acceptance of item 7; Scale type 3--acceptance of items 9 or 10; Scale type 4--acceptance of item 11; Scale type 5--acceptance of item 12. For item content see Table 1.

dicate the comparison of the results of the present study and Reiss's study on the universal scale for the total samples and for the respondent's own sex.

Tables 2 and 3 about here

For the researcher interested in permissiveness as measured by the PSP scale, the universal scale with fewer items is superior in terms of parsimony and equal in discriminating power. In fact if the purpose of the use of the PSP scale is to discriminate between groups high or low on permissiveness for crosstabulation analysis, then only one or two questions would be required. As will be discussed below, which questions are selected is important.

EXTENDING THE SCALE

When the four sexual variations items are added to the universal scale, they clearly fall into the scale at a higher permissive level than the comparable sexual intercourse items (Table 4). While the coefficient of reproducibility and the coefficient of scaleability are decreased somewhat, they remain within minimum acceptable limits.

Table 4 about here

These coefficients can be improved by scaling only the universal items and the sexual variations with no affection item. This is logical since this item is the only one which actually extends the scale.

The addition of the sexual variations items is problematic in that they add errors to the scale. Other data collected in the study showed

that some students regard sexual variations as defined as heavy petting and thus more acceptable prior to marriage than sexual intercourse. For example, nearly ten percent admitted to having engaged in variations, but not intercourse. The majority, however, view sexual variations as more advanced than intercourse[5] and only fifteen percent of the sample indicated that sexual variations are never acceptable.

DICHOTOMIZING PERMISSIVENESS

Reiss's analysis used the criterion of acceptance of full sexual relations under any of the levels of relationship-intensity as highly permissive and others as low permissive (Reiss, 1967:233). This dichotomy produced a 51 percent to 49 percent split in his samples which is most convenient for crosstabulation analysis. By using this same dichotomy in the present study, the split would be 77 percent to 23 percent, making crosstabulation analysis more difficult.

The Reiss dichotomy is conceptually convenient since the criterion focuses on behavior, i.e., full sexual relations. Another possibility for dichotomizing high and low permissive groups is to focus on the relational intensity rather than the behavior. In the present study it was possible to maintain a logical split containing nearly equal proportions of the sample by using sexual intercourse before marriage with no affection versus all others. In other words, all who accept premarital coitus under

---

[5]There are differences in the treatment of sexual variations by other authors. Podell and Perkins (1957) found oral-genital contacts were beyond coitus in a sexual experience scale. Robinson et al. (1968) treat oral-genital contacts as heavy petting.

the condition of no particular affection are defined as high-permissive and the rest are considered to be low-permissive. While most of the cross-tabulation analysis was done using both dichotomies, the Reiss dichotomy occasionally produced cells with very small numbers, especially in analysis beyond the zero order. Regression analysis allowing full variation of the permissiveness variable produced the most desirable results, however.

It is important to note that for regression analysis to be done at least the universal scale of the PSP is desirable. The changing level of sexual standards among United States college students is likely to produce problems in using the PSP scale if Reiss's dichotomy becomes the standard. On the other hand, the dichotomy used for crosstabulation analysis in the present study seems to be more logical in terms of sociological conceptions of sexual standards. The focus shifts from one behavior versus others to one type of social relationships versus others.

USES OF THE SCALE

Using the PSP scale in the same way Reiss did (Reiss, 1967, Appendix D) allows one to analyze answers in terms of behaviors, relational-intensity, double versus single standard, and intensity of acceptance. In his analysis, as in the present study, focus was on "permissiveness" rather than any of the specific dimensions. The behaviors appear to fall into a gross ordinal relation to each other. Kissing is clearly most likely to be acceptable premarital behavior followed by petting, sexual intercourse and sexual variations. This dimension has been the focus of a number of behavior-oriented researchers.[6] The relational-intensity dimension is a

---

[6]For a summary of some of these studies, see Packard, 1968:Appendices).

logical continuum and clearly falls into an ordinal pattern. Whether enough of this dimension is tapped as Clayton questions (1972:18), depends on the questions one seeks to answer with the PSP scale.

Analysis of the data from the present study indicates that there is a sufficient number of students adhering to the double standard[7] to consider this dimension as worthy of consideration for research. Evidence suggests the double standard is passing, but there remain some who believe that behaviors acceptable for males are not acceptable for females under the same conditions of relational intensity. The PSP scale allows one to independently determine the congruence of respondent's attitudes.

Regarding the intensity of response, it should be noted that Reiss recommends allowing six alternative answers from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This procedure was carried out in the present study and seemed to provide no problems. For purposes of analysis both the Reiss study and the present study ignored the response intensity considering answers to be dichotomized into either agree or disagree.

WHAT IS PERMISSIVENESS?

Recognition of the existence of various dimensions measurable with the PSP scale raises the basic question regarding what precisely is "permissiveness." At present the operational answer to this question appears to be "that which the PSP scale measures." In Reiss's terms, to be highly permissive one has simply to agree with the statement "I believe that full

---

[7]Those accepting premarital sexual intercourse for males but not for females ranged from 2.7 percent when engaged or in love, to 16.3 percent when no affection is present. Interestingly, the double standard was somewhat less for variations with no affection (13.1 percent).

sexual relations are acceptable for the male/female before marriage if they are engaged." In the present study the relational intensity criterion was changed from engaged to no particular affection. What the social significance of being high or low permissive is is not entirely clear although continued use of the PSP scale should help to spell this out.

Reiss's discussion of sexual standards is based on Rokeach's definition of an attitude (Reiss, 1967:123). This definition includes "predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (Rokeach, 1967). The problem here is that it is not clear whether the response one is predisposed to is verbal behavior, marking an alternative on a questionnaire or engaging or refusing to engage in premarital sexual behavior.

The term "permissive" carries a load of negative meaning in general usage which makes it unnecessarily value-laden for a scientific concept. The perspective implied by this term is consistent with other terms used by Reiss including "indulge," "temptation," and his reference to male and female as "opposite" sexes. It seems that the term "acceptance" would be less value-laden and more in line with a scientific conception of human sexuality.

Reiss has suggested (1967:36) that the PSP scale measures one's personal sexual standard, but this argument is not convincing. In spite of the disclaimer in the instructions to the scale which include:

> "We realize that you may be tolerant of what others do and think, but we are not now interested in that. We are interested in your own personal views about the questions...These questions do not concern what you do--they concern what you believe..." (Reiss, 1967,:21; emphasis in the original.)

It seems that the use of the phrases "for the male" and "for the female" are substantively different than "for me" or "for my closest friend of the other sex."

A solution to this problem is hard to find but is necessary for conceptual clarity. As one student in the present study indicated after having taken the questionnaire:

> "I have three levels of sexual standards: one is what I approve for other people, and that is very liberal; another level is what I intellectually approve for myself, and this is somewhat less liberal but is becoming more liberal all the time; and finally, there is the standard of behavior I engage in, and this is the most conservative of all."

Thus it would be inaccurate to assume that this student's approval of behavior for persons of her own sex is indicative of her own intellectual or behavioral standard.

Another example of the lack of clarity of the "permissiveness" variable measured by the PSP scale is the fact that several studies, including Reiss's and the present one, have used the scale to measure the "permissiveness" of married adults. This use implies that the conception of "permissiveness" includes acceptance of what other persons do. The scale, when used with samples which include married people, becomes generation specific.

Whether, for example, persons who are married are as accepting of sexual behaviors for themselves as for unmarried persons and especially their own children is an empirical question. Establishing a "self-permissiveness" score, for persons who obviously cannot engage in "premarital" intercourse and equating that with the "self-permissiveness" score of someone who can, requires some logical steps which are questionable.

PERMISSIVENESS AS TOLERANCE

In another instance Reiss uses the concept of "permissiveness" to include tolerance. In an article in the American Sociological Review, Reiss (1970) discusses the relationship between theories of deviance and premarital sexual permissiveness. He uses Clinard's definition of deviance:

> Only those situations in which behavior is in a disapproved direction, and of sufficient degree to exceed the tolerance limit of the community, constitute deviant behavior... (Clinard, 1963:22; emphasis in the original.)

Reiss argues that premarital coitus is deviant behavior since a majority of adults in his national sample did not believe it is acceptable. Thus there appears to be an interesting logical jump from persons indicating that they do not accept premarital sexual intercourse and the pattern of that response establishing a tolerance limit. This would seem to be highly questionable but worthy of empirical testing.

Aside from the questionable elimination of nonadults from his conception of the community, Reiss's equation of acceptance of premarital intercourse for persons of one's own sex with tolerance limits and lack of acceptance with intolerance is inaccurate and misleading. Since this seemed to be a problem which might be researched a tolerance scale was developed for the present study which enabled a comparison to be made between tolerance-intolerance regarding premarital sexual intercourse and permissiveness as measured by the PSP scale.

Tolerance was conceptualized as being on a continuum fron "no tolerance" to "encouragement." Students were asked to respond to a list of 36 items in terms of the answers most consistent with their own opinions. The answers were as follows: Should not be tolerated; Should be tolerated

but not approved or encouraged; Should be approved but not encouraged; and Should be encouraged. Table 5 indicates results of this question applied to premarital sex.

Table 5 about here

If the answer "Should not be tolerated" represents a response indicating the behavior is "beyond the tolerance limits" of the persons, then premarital sex is not deviant behavior for this group. Likewise if one accepts Reiss's criterion for establishing the tolerance limits "acceptance of full sexual relations" for persons of one's own sex, then premarital sex is not deviant behavior for this group either. The important point is, however, that there is a marked difference between the two criteria. As Table 6 shows, there is a strong positive relationship between tolerance of premarital sex and "permissiveness" using both the full sexual relations versus others dichotomy and the sexual intercourse with no particular affection versus others dichotomy.

Table 6 about here

As would be expected, no one who is highly permissive by either criterion believes premarital sex should not be tolerated. More importantly, however, 86.4 percent of those who are low-permissive by Reiss's criterion believe that premarital sex should be either tolerated or approved. One suspects that had Reiss asked his national adult sample about their tolerance of premarital sex, he would have found much less, if any, reason to argue for premarital sexual intercourse as deviant behavior.

One final problem with the PSP scale should be noted. As is the case with any attitude measurement, there is a tendency to treat permissiveness as a static entity rather than a measurement of a general process taken at a particular time. Factors influencing a response on the PSP scale for different respondents are assumed to be the same or of no consequence and thus different interpretations of the questions can lead to equating unequal attitudinal perspectives.

Rokeach (1968:128) points out that attitudes-toward-objects have been separated from attitudes-toward-situations. Even if one accepts the assumption that the three behaviors in the PSP scale are conceptually clear "objects," there still remains the problem of whether relational-intensity is the only important factor in the "situation" if it is conceptually categorized clearly. It would seem reasonable that other situational factors could be important for distinguishing between persons' attitudes.

This point might be pursued by further research into the conditions and qualifications respondents would give under which they would accept the idea of behaving inconsistent with their standard as measured by the PSP scale.

SUMMARY

The previous discussion has attempted to point out some findings, problems, and issues related to the use of the PSP scale. The concept of permissiveness is an important one in the study of sexual attitudes as evidenced by its extensive use by various researchers. The scale must be revised from time to time to reflect research findings and conceptual-

ization regarding the nature of permissiveness. As more researchers use the PSP scale, a growing body of knowledge regarding permissiveness will accumulate. As this occurs it will be increasingly incumbent upon social scientists to refine the concept and assist each other in developing, using, and understanding the measuring technique.

Ira Reiss's work is the pioneering effort in systematizing of research in premarital sexual permissiveness and a convenient bench mark but much needs to be done to clarify and refine the concept. It is hoped the present paper contributes to that effort.

TABLE 1

Comparison of Rank and Percent Accepting Male and Female PSP Scale Items in Two Studies

Item Number	Male Scale				Female Scale			
	Reiss[a] Study		Vandiver[b] Study		Reiss Study		Vandiver Study	
	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank
1. Kissing Engaged	97.5	2	99.7	1.5	98.5	2	98.7	1.5
2. Kissing in Love	98.9	1	99.7	1.5	99.1	1	98.3	3
3. Kissing Strong Affection	97.2	3	99.0	3	97.8	3	98.7	1.5
4. Kissing No Affection	64.2	7	92.0	6.5	55.2	7	88.0	7
5. Petting Engaged	85.0	4	95.0	4	81.8	4	93.7	4.5
6. Petting in Love	80.4	5	93.7	5	75.2	5	93.7	4.5
7. Petting Strong Affection	67.0	6	92.0	6.5	56.7	6	89.0	6
8. Petting No Affection	34.3	11	65.3	11	18.0	11	56.7	11
9. Coitus[b] Engaged	52.2	8	80.0	8	44.0	8	79.7	8
10. Coitus in Love	47.6	9	78.7	9	38.7	9	78.0	9
11. Coitus Strong Affection	36.9	10	69.3	10	27.2	10	65.3	10
12. Coitus No Affection	20.8	12	52.0	12	10.8	12	37.7	12
	N=811 CR=.95[c] CS=.85 MMR=.75		N=300 CR=.95[d] CS=.71 MMR=.84		N=806 CR=.95 CS=.85 MMR=.75		N=300 CR=.95 CS=.95 MMR=.83	

[a](Reiss 1967,33)

[b]Coitus refers to "full sexual relations" in Reiss's study and "sexual intercourse" in the present study.

[c]Reiss reports (1967:221) that for all samples his coefficient of reproducibility (CR)=.95, coefficient of scaleability (CS)=.85 and minimum marginal reproducibility (MMR)=.75.

[d]Statistical results from SPSS (Nie, et al., 1969) throughout the paper.

TABLE 2

Scale Items[a]	Reiss[b] Study		Vandiver Study	
	Male Scale	Female Scale	Male Scale	Female Scale
5	85%	82%	95%	94%
7	67	57	92	89
9	52	44	80	80
11	37	27	69	65
12	21	11	52	38
N	811	806	300	300
	CR=.97 CS=.89 MMR .70		CR.-.985 CS.-.936 MMR.-.770	.983 .922 .206

[a]See Table 1 for content of items. Percents rounded to nearest whole.

[b]Reiss (1967:29) student sample

TABLE 3

Comparison of Percent Accepting Universal PSP Items for Their Own Sex from Two Studies

Scale Items[a]	Reiss[b] Study		Vandiver Study	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
5	92	77	95	90
7	79	46	95	85
9	69	32	84	72
11	50	14	77	56
12	31	4	66	23
N=	405	440	174	123

[a]See Table 1 for scale item content. Percents rounded to nearest whole

[b]Reiss (1967:225) student sample

TABLE 4

Percent[a] Accepting Universal PSP Scale Items and Sexual Variations Items (Total Sample)

	Scale Item	Males	Females
5	Petting Engaged	95	94
7	Petting Strong Affection	92	89
9	Coitus Engaged	80	79
13	Variations Engaged	73	73
14	Variations in Love	71	69
11	Coitus Strong Affection	69	65
15	Variations Strong Affection	62	57
12	Coitus No Affection	51	37
16	Variations No Affections	41	31
		N=300	N=300
		CR-.926	.927
		CS-.735	.726
		MMR-.723	.733

[a]Percents rounded to nearest whole.

TABLE 5

Percent of Responses to Tolerance of Premarital Sex Item

Response	%	N
Should not be tolerated	3.4	(10)
Tolerated	26.9	(80)
Approved	56.9	(169)
Encouraged	12.8	(38)
TOTAL	100	297

Table 6

Relationship Between Premarital Sexual Permissiveness and Tolerance of Premarital Sex

Tolerance of Premarital Sex	Permissiveness: DICHOTOMY[a] 1 — Low Permissive %	N	High Permissive %	N	DICHOTOMY[b] 2 — Low Permissive %	N	High Permissive %	N
Should not be tolerated	13.6	(9)	0	(0)	5.8	(9)	0	(0)
Should be tolerated	56.1	(37)	19.0	(44)	40.0	(62)	13.4	(19)
Should be approved	30.3	(20)	64.9	(150)	47.1	(73)	67.6	(96)
Should be encouraged	0	(0)	16.0	(37)	7.1	(11)	19.0	(27)
TOTALS	100	(66)	100	(231)	100	(155)	100	(142)
	$\chi^2 = 73.53$, df = 3, $p < .001$, G = .80				$\chi^2 = 39.97$, df = 3, $p < .001$, G = .60			

[a]Dichotomy 1 uses Reiss' criterion of acceptance of any sexual intercourse item as highly permissive.

[b]Dichotomy 2 uses the criterion of acceptance of sexual intercourse with no affection as highly permissive.

REFERENCES

Bell, Robert R. and J. B. Chaskes

1970 "Premarital sexual experience among coeds, 1958 and 1968." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32(February):81-84.

Cardwell, Jerry D.

1969 "The relationship between religious commitment and premarital sexual permissiveness: A five dimensional analysis." Sociological Analysis 30(Summer):72-80.

Clayton, Richard R.

1972 "Ira L. Reiss revisited: A critical analysis of the premarital sexual permissiveness scales." Paper presented at the Midwest Sociological Society meetings, Kansas City (April).

Clinard, Marshall B.

1963 Sociology of Deviant Behavior, Revised Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Davenport, Beverly S.

1966 "An empirical investigation of the relationship between courtship and premarital sexual standards." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Iowa.

Harrison, D. E., W. H. Bennett, and G. Globetti

1969 "Attitudes of rural youth toward premarital sexual permissiveness." Journal of Marriage and the Family 31(November):783-787.

Heltsley, Mary E. and C. B. Broderick

1969 "Religiosity and premarital sexual permissiveness: reexamination of Reiss' traditionalism proposition." Journal of Marriage and the Family 31(August):441-443.

Kaats, Gilbert R. and Keith E. Davis

1970 "The dynamics of sexual behavior of college students." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32(August):390-399.

1971 "Effects of volunteer biases in studies of sexual behavior and attitudes." Journal of Sex Research 7(February):26-34.

Maranell, G. M., R. A. Dodder, and D. F. Mitchell

1970 "Social class and premarital sexual permissiveness: A subsequent test." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32(February):85-88.

Middendorp, C. P., W. Brinkman, and W. Koomen

1970 "Determinants of premarital sexual permissiveness: A secondary analysis." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32(August): 369-379.

Nie, N. H., D. A. Bent, and C. H. Hull

1970 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill.

Packard, Vance

1968 The Sexual Wilderness. New York: David McKay.

Podell, Lawrence and John Perkins

1957 "A Guttman scale for sexual experience--a methodological note." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 54(May):420-422.

Reiss, Ira

1960 Premarital Sexual Standards in America. New York: The Free Press.

1963 "Sociological studies of sexual standards." In Winokur, George (ed.), Determinants of Human Sexual Behavior. Springfield, Illinois: Charles Thomas.

1964a "Premarital sexual permissiveness among Negroes and whites." American Sociological Review 29(October):688-698.

1964b "The scaling of premarital sexual permissiveness." Journal of Marriage and the Family 26(May):188-198.

1965 "Social class and premarital sexual permissiveness: A reexamination." American Sociological Review 30(October): 747-756.

1967 The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

1970 "Premarital sex as deviant behavior: A test of current approaches to deviance." American Sociological Review 35 (February): 78-87.

1971 The Family System in America. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Robinson, Ira E., Karl King, C. J. Dudley, and F. J. Clune

1968 "Change in sexual behavior and attitudes of college students." The Family Coordinator 16(April):119-123.

Rokeach, Milton

1967 "Attitude change and behavioral change." Public Opinion Quarterly 30(Winter):529-550.

1968 Beliefs Attitude and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ruppel, Howard J., Jr.

1969 "Religiosity and premarital sexual permissiveness: A methodological note." Sociological Analysis 30(Fall):1760188.

1970 "Religiosity and premarital sexual permissiveness: A response to the Reiss-Heltsley and Broderick debate." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32(November):647-655.

Vandiver, R. D.

1972 Sources and Interrelation of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness and General Liberality-Conservatism. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Walsh, Robert

1970 "Intergenerational transmission of sexual standards." Paper read at 65th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (September).

Walsh, Robert and C. Susmilch

1969 "Love, dating stages and premarital sexual permissiveness: A further examination." Paper presented at meetings of Midwest Sociological Society (May).